

CPYRGHT

KNOWLEDGE EXPORTED TO POOR NEIGHBORHOODS (By Kenneth Eskey)

This has been a banner year on college campuses for demonstrations, protests, upheavals, and revolts.

Generally overlooked was a quiet form of activity known as tutoring.

Hundreds of Pittsburgh college students spent their afternoons and evenings in settlement houses and church basements, helping boys and girls learn arithmetic and spelling, physics and French.

If campus debates on Vietnam are teachings, perhaps the tutoring sessions in city neighborhoods can be called teachouts.

The teachouts here stem from the civil rights and antipoverty movements. Much of the tutoring is done in poor neighborhoods, where children often need extra help to keep up with more fortunate classmates.

Chatham College students have been working at Fifth Avenue High School and Herron Hill Junior High School since 1963.

Action-Housing has been using college students as tutors in Homewood-Brushston, Hazelwood, and the Perry Hilltop area.

But the largest tutoring programs in town are the Hill education project (HEP) at the University of Pittsburgh and the North Side tutorial project in Manchester.

HEP is strictly a student operation. Pitt's contribution is a room on the fifth floor of Schenley Hall.

This year's cochairmen were Irv Garfinkel, a history major from Squirrel Hill who wants to be a social worker, and Marcia McNutt, a doctor's daughter from Ford City who considers HEP a full-time job.

Marcia figures HEP is a good energy outlet. "Some students just sit around smoking marijuana and drinking booze," she said, without citing any cases.

Her biggest problem—a shortage of tutors. "See those files," she said, pointing to an open drawer. "Those are requests we can't handle."

As many as 250 students have been active tutors during the school year, and another 50 to 75 worked as supervisors or youth club directors.

The tutoring force has dwindled to about 60 since the end of Pitt's winter trimester in April, but a major summer program is planned for July and August.

Most of the tutoring is done at the Heldman Center in the Hill district. Tutors are expected to work 2 to 4 hours a week, usually late afternoons and evenings.

There is no pay, only the satisfaction of doing a job.

The North Side tutorial project uses students from other Pittsburgh colleges. Like HEP, it started in 1963.

Supervisor of the North Side program is Mary Frances Brown, who gets a salary through the United Fund, operates out of Manchester House and attends Duquesne University part time.

The 110 tutors in her program are unpaid and generally put in one afternoon or evening a week.

Many of the tutors come from the other side of town.

Janet Braunstein, a sophomore at Carnegie Institute of Technology, commutes from her home in Greenfield each week to the Bidwell Street Presbyterian Church to tutor a fifth grader in English.

How many tutoring programs there are in the city no one knows, but the list is growing rather than shrinking.

Duquesne and Mt. Mercy College students have been tutoring at Brashear Center in the South Side and the Mount Mercy students also tutor at St. Clair Village.

The School of Education at Duquesne has a special program for teachers preparing for jobs in poor neighborhoods and runs its own tutoring program on the side.

College students will serve this summer as assistant teachers in Project Head Start, an antipoverty program to prepare children for kindergarten and first grade.

Literacy and Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned at the inconsistency of a voting rights bill which purports to give every citizen the right to vote by eliminating literacy tests but gives only passing recognition to the more widespread discrimination from the levying of a poll tax.

A Toledo Blade editorial of May 27, "Literacy and Poll Taxes," points up the incongruity in the argument over the constitutionality of prohibiting literacy tests and the unconstitutionality of banning poll taxes and logically concludes that a poll tax actually results in wider discrimination by keeping more people, both white and Negro, from exercising their right to vote than literacy tests aimed at racial discrimination. This is a point well worth considering in the days ahead, and it is my hope that this body will act to eliminate the poll tax as well as to outlaw literacy tests. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as part of my remarks the Toledo Blade editorial to which I referred and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

LITERACY AND POLL TAXES

With administration leaders planning to invoke cloture to force a vote in the Senate on the voting rights bill, two arguments continue on its constitutionality.

The effort by northern liberals to impose a flat prohibition on poll taxes in State and local elections has been sidetracked, at least temporarily.

By a slim majority, the Senate voted against that provision, on the grounds that it was probably unconstitutional. Instead, it adopted a declaration that in certain States the right to vote is denied or abridged by requiring poll tax payments.

This is intended to strengthen the hand of Attorney General Katzenbach in getting the Supreme Court to invalidate poll taxes for that reason.

On the other hand, the Senate majority brushed aside southern opposition to a provision of the bill which will prohibit literacy tests in five Southern States and parts of two others. It rejected an amendment which would have required a voter, regardless of race, to prove only that he could read and write English.

Favoring a strong voting rights bill though we do, what baffles us is the inconsistency by which the Senate majority goes adamantly ahead in banning literacy tests but hesitates to do the same for poll taxes.

Poll taxes, on their face, restrict voting rights to those who can afford to pay for the privilege. If they have been employed for years to bar Negroes from the polls in some of the Southern States, they have also been equally effective in keeping a great many whites from voting.

Their elimination would extend voting rights to both groups indiscriminantly.

Barring literacy tests only in five Southern States and parts of two others would be Federal discrimination with a vengeance. In New York State, where uniform literacy tests are required for voters who cannot produce an eighth-grade certificate, it is estimated that 15 percent of those taking the test fail every year.

Is Federal law to presume that all the people in Alabama and Mississippi are smarter than these New Yorkers?

As for the contention that any literacy test could be employed to deny Negroes their voting rights, what about California's, where a person seeking to register need only be able to write his name in English?

A key provision of the voting rights bill is that Federal examiners shall register voters in areas where discrimination is practiced. What could be simpler than to have them register by signing their names in English, as is done in California?

New York State Legislature Urges President and Congress To Condemn Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York on May 12, 1965, urging our Government to take an official stand against Soviet anti-Semitism:

RESOLUTION 90

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to condemn anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and to take steps to prevent further persecutions of, and acts of terrorism and confiscation against, Jews residing therein

Whereas the people of the State of New York and of the United States are deeply shocked by reports appearing in the press and elsewhere concerning the continued oppression, persecution and tyranny of the Government of Soviet Russia directed toward Russian Jewry residing in Soviet Russia; and

Whereas many acts of terrorism, confiscation and persecution have already been committed against such Jewry and even more serious acts are threatened; and

Whereas such acts have resulted, unjustly and unwarrantedly, in the confiscation of property and in the deprivation of rights, privileges and immunities possessed by the Jewish people in that country; and

Whereas the Government of the United States because of its humanitarian interests in the various peoples of this country and their interest in and relationship to the persecuted Jews of Soviet Russia, should register emphatic protest with the Russian Government with a firm request that it should cease and desist in its program of persecution; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has on other occasions intervened and interceded in behalf of persecuted minorities in other countries: Now, therefore, be it

CPYRGH

June 9, 1965

The People of the Seventh District of Alabama Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege as repre-

sentative of the great Seventh District of Alabama to give the people, for the first time, an opportunity to share with their representative in Congress their views on the vital issues of the day. The return on the questionnaire I sent to my constituents exceeded 11 percent and is an indication of the interest and concern of our people in all of the problems facing our Nation and the world.

In addition to answering the questions, many of the returned questionnaires were accompanied by letters and remarks detailing a specific concern of the writer.

Results of 7th District, Alabama, questionnaire

This free exchange of views between the people and their representative is an important part of the successful functioning of representative government.

I want to congratulate the people of the Seventh District on the thought and care with which they considered this questionnaire. It is a tribute to the intelligence and dedication to democratic principles of the people I have the honor to represent. I am sure my colleagues would be interested in the results of this poll and I include it as a part of these remarks:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe the Federal Government must operate within a balanced budget?	89.6	6.9
2. Do you favor a medical care program for the elderly through—		
(a) Increasing social security taxes?	16.2	18.2
(b) Purchase of private insurance that is tax exempt?	27.6	5.6
(c) Voluntary plans without Federal participation?	40.1	4.2
3. Would you favor Federal aid to education even if it meant Federal control of schools—		
(a) For teachers' salaries?	11.8	78.4
(b) For school construction?	16.8	71.8
(c) For any other purpose?	9.1	71.6
4. Do you favor the proposal to change the present quota system to increase immigration from the Pacific-Asian and African nations?	4.1	89.6
5. Do you favor a sharp reduction in—		
(a) Foreign aid to Communist nations?	81.8	12.9
(b) Foreign aid to our allies?	63.8	28.1
(c) All foreign aid spending?	69.5	23.0
6. Do you favor a minimum guaranteed living of \$3,000 per year at taxpayers' expense for all Americans whether or not they earn it?	4.6	91.3
7. Labor:		
(a) Do you favor repeal of sec. 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act which would make State right-to-work laws illegal?	16.4	64.0
(b) Do you favor leaving the right-to-work laws on the books under the control of the States?	79.2	8.9
8. Do you favor expanding peaceful coexistence with Soviet Russia and other Communist nations?	40.0	46.8
9. Do you favor an amendment to the Constitution which again would make prayers legal in our schools?	89.9	5.8
10. Do you favor—		
(a) Repeal of the civil rights bill?	62.3	10.2
(b) Modification of the civil rights bill?	34.8	6.5
11. Do you favor an agricultural program which will—		
(a) Maintain rigid supports and quotas to regulate farm economy?	16.7	6.6
(b) Gradually ease supports allowing farm commodities to seek a free market?	60.9	1.9
(c) Have no supports, no controls, immediate free farm economy?	14.9	5.6
12. Do you favor doing away with the Army Reserve and combining its functions with the National Guard?	36.0	46.1
13. Do you favor a proposal now being discussed for introduction to Congress that would require you to register your firearms?	38.3	54.9
14. Do you favor reapportionment of the State legislature by—		
(a) Federal Government	4.7	26.4
(b) State Government	89.0	

CPYRGH

America the Beautiful—And Long Island, Too?

Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, action to restore the natural beauty along our Nation's highways is long overdue. Recently the President proposed much needed legislation which will implement a program to rid the areas near our highways of unsightly junkyards and an overabundance of billboards. I commend Newsday for the following informative editorial and urge every Member of Congress to support the President on this legislation:

[From the Long Island Newsday, June 1, 1965]

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—AND LONG ISLAND, TOO?

President Johnson, at the conclusion of a conference last week on the preservation of national beauty, announced some bold steps essential to any sound program. For years, there has been hand wringing about the state of American highways—the billboard

blight always, the cancerous growth of auto junkyards recently. Robert Moses, through his Long Island parkways, first reversed this trend by establishing the precedent of a green barrier strip to shut out unsightliness. The Federal Government, through its vast interstate highway system, sought to achieve the same end through bonuses to the States. The assorted State turnpike authorities or commissions, to a greater or lesser degree, set up some controls. But nobody laid it on the line better, or more clearly defined the issues, than did the President last week.

Mr. Johnson asked Congress to take four significant steps:

1. Except in areas "zoned or used predominantly for commercial or industrial purposes," the States would be required to prohibit billboards within 1,000 feet of interstate and primary Federal-aid highways, these in New York including major State highways. The penalty: the loss of Federal-aid moneys for the construction of such roads.

2. New junkyards would be banned within 1,000 feet, and existing eyesores of this type would have to be screened or removed by 1970. The same penalty could be invoked.

3. States would be required to use 3 percent of Federal highway aid (about \$120 million at present levels) for beautification along the roads.

4. One-third of the Federal aid received for secondary roads (about \$100 million) would have to be used to construct scenic secondary roads, or to construct access roads to beauty spots, or for landscaping along present roads.

These are all concrete suggestions. Surprisingly, the billboard industry, after its long fight against regulation, has said it will go along. The Johnson bills are fine. Instead of simply wringing his hands at the erosion of natural beauty, the President has proposed some solid remedies.

Knowledge Exported to Poor Neighborhoods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, college students in my congressional district in Pittsburgh have undertaken in recent months their own war on poverty by tutoring children in poor neighborhoods of our city, thus making a positive contribution in helping those children keep up with classmates who have had greater educational advantages.

Mr. Kenneth Eskey in the June 8 issue of the Pittsburgh Press has written an excellent report on this significant activity. I include Mr. Eskey's report at this point in my remarks:

June 9, 1965

Resolved (if the senate concur). That the President and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to condemn anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and that the Secretary of State of the United States of America be and he hereby is respectfully memorialized to lodge an official protest on behalf of the Government of the United States with the Russian Government against the concerted attack presently being continued directly and indirectly, by the latter government toward Russian Jews residing in such country and that the Department of State be and it hereby is respectfully memorialized to employ its best diplomatic efforts in an attempt to persuade the Russian Government to desist from any further persecutions and acts of terrorism and confiscation complained of in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur). That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to do everything possible to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the assembly

JOHN T. MCKENNAN, Clerk.

In senate, May 12, 1965, concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the senate.

GEORGE H. VAN LINGEN, Secretary.

David Rockefeller Says United States Can Absorb Slash in Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that an economy as buoyant and imaginative as that of the United States should look upon projected reductions in defense spending as an opportunity rather than a problem.

I was delighted to note in the Monday, June 7 issue of the Wall Street Journal that one of the most thoughtful members of the business community, Chase Manhattan Bank President David Rockefeller, expressed a similar view in a recent Seattle address.

Mr. Rockefeller pointed out that leading defense firms need not be restricted to defense problems. He said:

The fact is that they are in the problem-solving business and this Nation is a long way from running out of problems.

I commend Mr. Rockefeller's remarks to all of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent to include the Wall Street Journal account of his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

DAVID ROCKEFELLER SAYS UNITED STATES CAN ABSORB SLASH IN DEFENSE SPENDING: CHASE BANK PRESIDENT CITES NEED TO STRESS GROWTH POSSIBILITIES MILITARY CUTBACK WOULD AFFORD

NEW YORK.—David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank, said the United States could stand a heavy reduction in de-

defense spending in the next few years without serious disruption of the national economy.

In a Seattle speech, Mr. Rockefeller said the cutbacks could be absorbed if business, communities, and Government take "sensible steps to re gear the defense machinery to civilian needs."

"I feel that too much emphasis has been placed on the problem of conversion and too little on the opportunities it affords for strengthening our longrun growth potential," he asserted. "Fear of the economic impact of defense cutbacks has been exaggerated to the point where it has obscured for many people the underlying dynamism of our economy and its remarkable resilience in adjusting to change."

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

Mr. Rockefeller suggested that the current 9 to 10 percent contribution of defense activities to the gross national product could safely be cut back to 5 percent or even lower if, as projected, the gross national product rises to about \$780 billion by 1970 from the present \$660 billion. That reduction, he said, could be effected "without imposing an unsustainable burden and, I would hope, without weakening our defenses."

Already, Mr. Rockefeller noted, there are many instances in which communities where military installations have been closed have replaced them with nondefense industries. Also, he said numerous industries are applying techniques learned in defense production to new types of civilian-goods production. He cited specifically the success of Seattle-based Boeing Co. in expanding commercial aircraft sales as military sales declined.

"Many defense contractors do themselves an injustice in conveying the impression that they can work only on missiles and space vehicles," Mr. Rockefeller said. "The fact is that they are in the problem-solving business, and this Nation is a long way from running out of problems."

SPACE AND URBAN TRANSIT

"The market for systems-oriented companies that offer scientific, manufacturing, financial and training skills is expanding daily. Imagine the results of applying the countdown, precision of a space launch to such problems as urban transportation, improved air travel, better communications and weather forecasting, and more reliable highway traffic-control systems.

"It seems reasonable to assume that the 'brain teams' that have figured out how to put a man on the moon should be able to get a man to work a little more quickly and efficiently."

As areas in which money saved by lower defense spending could be used to "provide rich dividends in terms of enhanced human well-being," Mr. Rockefeller mentioned education, urban rehabilitation, health, highways and conservation. A major part of Federal tax savings, he urged, should be channeled into private hands "to support private investment in the vast task of rebuilding our cities," with State and local governments given access to more money for schools and other community facilities.

Griffin Is Right but Cause Is Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of

the Taft-Hartley law has been the subject of newspaper editorials throughout the United States. Few, however, have so dramatically called the attention of their readers to the provisions of H.R. 4350, introduced by my colleague from Michigan, the Honorable ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, as the editorial published May 31 in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, a newspaper published in my district. I commend the editorial for the RECORD at this point:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, May 31, 1965]

GRIFFIN IS RIGHT BUT CAUSE IS LOST

Michigan Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN has a just cause in his formula for repealing and modifying the controversial right-to-work section of the Taft-Hartley law.

But his cause is lost. He lacks the support of President Johnson, is violently opposed by organized labor, and the liberals who should be backing Representative GRIFFIN are looking the other way.

The Michigan Congressman and coauthor of the only major change made in the Nation's labor laws since Taft-Hartley has put forth a right-to-work repealer which is magnificent in its simplicity and potential effectiveness.

Briefly, his measure would deny the union shop concession to unions which practice discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color, which use mandatory union dues for political purposes, and which deny members the right to disagree with union leadership.

These propositions seem fair enough but GRIFFIN hasn't a chance of winning approval for them.

As a Michigan representative, Mr. GRIFFIN has no objections to repeal of section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact right-to-work laws. These are statutes which make it impossible to demand union membership for an individual as a condition of employment.

An area which achieved a great deal of maturity in labor-management relations, Michigan has no need for a right-to-work law. Such a statute never has been seriously considered here.

The necessity for unions and the need for security for them long have been recognized here. Right-to-work laws too often are used by States as a method of suppressing the union movement and thus offer lures to industries which don't want to deal with organized labor. Such laws inevitably lead to the curtailment of the rights of the worker to organize and bargain collectively.

Michigan industrial leaders, especially those heading large companies, will admit privately they would find it extremely difficult to do business without the unions.

The equal job opportunity feature of the Griffin proposition is one that should fit in with the effort today to strengthen the civil rights of all individuals.

The argument against it and the other proposals by the Michigan congressmen is that there are laws on the books which cover the situations involved and that it would be better to strengthen these than to provide remedies for injustice in the Taft-Hartley law.

The trouble is that the laws do not work well, or have been weakened by court decisions which give a special status to labor unions. The tendency is to be most lenient with the unions.

Discrimination is not universal in the unions by any means. Many organizations have done extremely well by the minorities and especially the colored workers. They have every right to membership and to employment on an equal footing with all others.

CPYRGH

T

June 9, 1965

CPYRGH

A2992

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

The abuses in this field, however limited, should not be tolerated.

The Congress or State legislatures may pass all sorts of civil rights law giving the Negro the right to vote, to patronize any business establishment, live where he pleases, send his children to any school, and so on and on. But one of his most important rights is that of making a living. The Congress doesn't seem disposed to enforce that right if it means coming head to head with the leadership of the unions which do practice discrimination.

The President's failure to mention or endorse any qualification of the section 14(b) repealer perhaps is understandable. He owes a political debt to organized labor which he must pay.

He has to do this, as a politician, because he has been making friends in the business-management community. No Democratic President since Wilson has been so kindly received by businessmen.

Because organized labor is one of the foundation stones of the Democratic Party, the President has to make certain that he does not offend union leaders by ignoring their demands while getting along well with the persons on the other side of the wage contract bargaining table. The party, as well as his own fortunes, is involved.

Not so understandable is the opposition GRIFTIN is meeting from the hot-eyed liberals who make civil rights a holy cause.

They make rafter-rattling speeches about the rights of man. They condemn discrimination, particularly in the South.

But given a chance to strike an effective blow for those rights, and particularly that most basic right of equal opportunity on the job, they seem not at all interested.

Perhaps their reasons are the same as we accorded to the President. They, too, depend on union help in getting elected. They are wildly vocal on civil rights until a stand on a definite issue might interfere with their own political fortunes.

Statesmen are not measured by this standard.

May Day or Law Day—Which?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the text of an article written by Hon. Warren Jefferson Davis, a distinguished member of the bar of the State of California. In his article, Mr. Davis sounds a warning against the trend toward the concentration of power in the Federal Establishment, and calls for a rededication to the basic principles of constitutionalism. Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of the House, as follows:

MAY DAY OR LAW DAY—WHICH?

(By Warren Jefferson Davis)

May Day, which falls on May 1, is commonly thought to stand for the success of the Russian Revolution. The true significance of the date can be understood, however only in terms of the continuance of the "World Revolution."

The date has its antecedent in the founding of the "Illuminati," on May 1, 1776, by one Adam Weishaupt, after he had spent 5 years formulating the idea and methods of deception.

The "Illuminati" was exposed by the Bavarian Government in October 1786, after the seizure of documents exposing the methods used by the conspirators. The organization went underground, and was succeeded by various and sundry organizations fronting for it.

On page 22 of "World Revolution," by Nesta H. Webster, we find the aims of the "Illuminati" reduced to a simple six-point formula:

1. Abolition of monarchies, and of all ordered government.
2. Abolition of private property.
3. Abolition of inheritance.
4. Abolition of patriotism.
5. Abolition of the family, which is to say, of marriage and all morality, and the institution of the communal education of children.
6. Abolition of all religion.

"Now," says the author, "it will surely be admitted that the above forms a program hitherto unprecedented in the history of civilization. Communist theories had been held by isolated thinkers, or groups of thinkers, since the days of Plato, but no one, as far as we know, had ever yet seriously proposed to destroy everything for which civilization stands."

This code is carried out by communism today, and is celebrated each year on May Day, in memory of the "Illuminati," and not just for the success in Russia, which was really their first big success.

Law Day is the answer by lawyers to the attacks made on the rule of law, at home and abroad. Its annual observance by bar associations, and lawyers individually, is made necessary by the phenomenal rise of socialism and communism throughout our country, and in the world at large.

The president of the Los Angeles Bar Association, in a message to the membership, 6,000 or more, has called attention to the efforts of lawyers, at the time of the American Revolution, through letters to friends, to defend "liberty throughout the world." He has asked each member to write 10 letters on the significance of Law Day, thereby enabling our association to contact some 600,000 people.

You comprise the audience with whom I would like to share my thoughts on Law Day, as opposed to May Day, 1965. My message to you might well be entitled: "The People Versus Federal Officials Who Have Violated Their Oath of Office."

At Runnymede, England, in the fall of 1957, members of the American Bar Association dedicated a lasting memorial to the principles of Magna Carta.

On their return home from their pilgrimage, they could have issued a call for rededication of our 250,000 lawyers and our entire people, to the Constitution and Bill of Rights, and to the preservation of our republican constitutional form of Government.

Instead, the national voice was stilled when both a Federal statute and the Constitution itself were violated by the invasion of a sovereign State of the Union by armed forces of the United States, under order of the then Chief Executive.

Our people have been so brainwashed by Communist doctrines that they no longer protest when the majority of "activist" members of the U.S. Supreme Court, as now constituted and led by Earl Warren, operating under the spell of psychosociological fantasy, appears in the role of chief offender against the rule of law.

A rededication of our entire people to the Constitution and Bill of Rights is imperative if our republican constitutional form of government is to survive.

Accordingly, I am writing to you, and others, in the effort to achieve this objective.

An incoming President takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies—foreign and domestic. Foreign enemies probably will give Mr. Johnson less

concern. But what of domestic assaults on the Constitution?

The American formula for survival in this atomic age is strict limitation upon the power of government. Some professed liberals, however, are seeking to undermine our Constitution, and liberate our Government from all constitutional limitations. This process has taken the form of unlimited taxing and spending by our Government.

Over 700 Government-owned corporations are operating in direct competition with private enterprise. Where is the constitutional authority, in the original document or through amendment, that permits the Federal Government to operate power companies, insurance or manufacturing businesses, or other components of the welfare-illfare state? The powers not specifically delegated are reserved to the States under the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

In these crucial times, is not too much emphasis put on so-called rights, when wrongs are being inflicted on the Constitution?

The field of education, for example, is not excluded from State control, but it is excluded from Federal control, because it has never been delegated to the Federal Government, and is reserved under the 10th amendment.

The 14th amendment, if relied on for justification, was never legally adopted. Three-fourths of the States failed to ratify, and New Jersey and Ohio rescinded their previous ratifications. The 14th amendment, however, has never been legally applicable, because only to the Congress is given the power to enforce its provisions.

The Constitution has been grossly disregarded, and the socialistic theories of a Swede, Gunnar Myrdal, substituted, by means of a court decision, under which the Constitution is thought to be outmoded as impractical and unsuited to modern conditions; that its adoption was nearly a plot against the common people. In recent years, court decisions have ranged from forced integration to forced reapportionment. Such decisions, is not conforming to the law of the land, fall under the heading of what Justice Cardozo would have called enforceable decrees, but not real decisions. Such decisions are thought by many to be lawless, in that the court presumes to make law, a power it does not have.

Article IV, section 4, guarantees to every State a republican form of government, and protection against invasion either by Federal troops or U.S. marshals, except on application of the legislature or the State's executive. The use of force, to implement an invalid decree, is in direct violation of the constitutional provision.

The Civil Rights Act of 1960 was alleged to contain 11 or more specific violations of the Constitution. The Civil Rights Act of 1965, illegal and unconstitutional on its face, is to be used as a club against Virginia and States in the Deep South, which did not support the administration in the recent presidential election.

Will there be anything left of the Constitution, unless these usurpations of power by Federal agencies are checked?

The Federal Government is today imposing on the States and the people in the same manner that the central government under George III imposed upon the American colonists in 1776.

"The British monarch has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance."

Does that sound familiar?

Federal bureaucracy is rampant throughout the land, to the point of confiscation, and Federal agencies operate to enforce centralized authority, rather than reflect the will of the people.